

REMARKS

The present response requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

The claims are rejected based on Sano in view of Watanabe; claim 4 is also rejected further in view of Pluddemann; claims 5, 6 and 18-20 are also rejected further in view of van der kolk. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is submitted that the combination of Sano and Watanabe teaches away from the claimed invention, such that it is unnecessary to address either the Pluddemann or van der kolk references.

Specifically, these references are combined based on Sano's desiring mechanical and thermal resistance (1:34-51) and Watanabe allegedly offering such properties (27:33-29:15). Page 4 of the OA, the full para. However, the problem with this reasoning is that Sano specifies that it realizes the desired mechanical and thermal resistance by using "an aqueous polymeric silicate solution as a binder which has a particular viscoelastic property." (1:34-51, 45-47). This means that Sano teaches away from replacing its particular aqueous polymeric silicate solution.

Any statements in the Office Action not specifically discussed herein are not agreed to thereby.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lainie E. Parker', is written over a horizontal line.

Lainie E. Parker
Reg. No. 36,123
Attorney for Applicant

Akzo Nobel Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept.
7 Livingstone Avenue
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522-3408
(914) 674-5466